

are the only terms intended to have a specialized meaning when used in these proposed special conditions:

(a) **Basic Airframe Structure.** Includes design elements such as structural members, structural joint features, and fastener systems including airplane skins, ribs, spars, stringers, etc., and associated fasteners, joints, coatings, and sealant. Basic airframe structure may also include those structural elements that are expected to be removed for maintenance, such as exterior fuel tank access panels and fairing attachment features, provided maintenance errors that could compromise associated lightning protection features would be evident upon an exterior preflight inspection of the airplane and would be corrected prior to flight.

(b) **Permanent Systems Supporting Structure.** Includes static, permanently attached structural parts (such as brackets) that are used to support system elements. It does not include any part intended to be removed, or any joint intended to be separated, to maintain or replace system elements or other parts, unless that part removal or joint separation is accepted by the FAA as being extremely remote.

(c) **Manufacturing Variability.** Includes tolerances and variability allowed by the design and production specifications as well as anticipated errors or escapes from the manufacturing and inspection processes.

(d) **Extremely Remote.** Conditions that are not anticipated to occur to each airplane during its total life, but which may occur a few times when considering the total operational life of all airplanes of one type. Extremely remote conditions are those having an average probability per flight hour on the order of 1×10^{-7} or less, but greater than on the order of 1×10^{-9} .

(e) **Extremely Improbable.** Conditions that are so unlikely that they are not anticipated to occur during the entire operational life of all airplanes of one type. Extremely improbable conditions are those having an average probability per flight hour of the order of 1×10^{-9} or less.

2. Alternative Fuel Tank Structural Lightning Protection Requirements

For lightning protection features that are integral to fuel tank basic airframe structure or permanent systems supporting structure, as defined in this these proposed special conditions, Definitions, for which Airbus shows and the FAA finds compliance with § 25.981(a)(3) to be impractical, the following requirements may be applied

in lieu of the requirements of § 25.981(a)(3):

(a) Airbus must show that the airplane design meets the requirements of part 25, Appendix M, as amended by Amendment 25–125, for all fuel tanks installed on the airplane.

(b) Airbus must show that the design includes at least two independent, effective, and reliable lightning protection features (or sets of features) such that fault tolerance to prevent lightning-related ignition sources is provided for each area of the structural design proposed to be shown compliant with these proposed special conditions in lieu of compliance with the requirements of § 25.981(a)(3). Fault tolerance is not required for any specific design feature if:

(1) For that feature, providing fault tolerance is shown to be impractical, and

(2) Fuel tank vapor ignition due to that feature and all other non-fault-tolerant features, when their fuel tank vapor ignition event probabilities are summed, is shown to be extremely improbable.

(c) Airbus must perform an analysis to show that the design, manufacturing processes, and airworthiness limitations section of the instructions for continued airworthiness include all practical measures to prevent, and detect and correct, failures of structural lightning protection features due to manufacturing variability, aging, wear, corrosion, and likely damage.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 15, 2013.

John P. Piccola, Jr.,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2013–30236 Filed 12–18–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA–2013–0922; Airspace Docket No. 13–AWA–5]

RIN 2120–AA66

Proposed Modification of the Philadelphia, PA, Class B Airspace Area

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This action proposes to amend the description of Area G of the

Philadelphia Class B airspace area to correct a design error that resulted in the Class B airspace being published 2.1 nautical miles (NM) larger on the southeast side of the area than intended. No other changes to the Philadelphia Class B airspace are being proposed.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 3, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on this proposal to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001; telephone: (202) 366–9826. You must identify FAA Docket No. FAA–2013–0922 and Airspace Docket No. 13–AWA–5 at the beginning of your comments. You may also submit comments through the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Gallant, Airspace Policy and Regulations Group, Office of Airspace Services, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–8783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal.

Communications should identify both docket numbers (FAA Docket No. FAA–2013–0922 and Airspace Docket No. 13–AWA–5) and be submitted in triplicate to the Docket Management Facility (see **ADDRESSES** section for address and phone number). You may also submit comments through the internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this action must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: “Comments to Docket Nos. FAA–2013–0922 and Airspace Docket No. 13–AWA–5.” The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter.

All communications received on or before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this action may

be changed in light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination in the public docket both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

Availability of NPRMs

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded through the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

You may review the public docket containing the proposal, any comments received and any final disposition in person in the Dockets Office (see **ADDRESSES** section for address and phone number) between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the office of the Eastern Service Center, Federal Aviation Administration, Room 210, 1701 Columbia Ave., College Park, GA 30337.

Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRMs should contact the FAA's Office of Rulemaking, (202) 267-9677, for a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11-2A, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Distribution System, which describes the application procedure.

Background

On May 9, 2013, the FAA published a final rule modifying the Philadelphia Class B airspace area (78 FR 27025, July 25, 2013). After publication, it was found that Area G extended 2.1 NM farther southeast than intended from the Philadelphia International Airport. This was caused by the miscalculation of two points during the design of the Area G boundaries.

The Proposal

The FAA is proposing to amend Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 71 to correct two points used to define the boundaries of Area G in the description of the Philadelphia Class B airspace area. Specifically, the point that reads “. . . the intersection of the PHL 20-mile radius and the 136° bearing from PHL . . .” would be changed to read “. . . the intersection of the 17.9-mile radius and the 138° bearing from PHL . . .” This point appears in two places in the Area G description. In addition, the point that reads “. . . the intersection of the PHL 20-mile radius and the 120° bearing from PHL . . .” would be changed to read “. . . the intersection of the 20-mile radius and the 118° bearing from PHL . . .” This point appears once in the Area G

description. This change would result in a small reduction in the lateral dimensions of Class B airspace southeast of Philadelphia International Airport, near the Cross Keys Airport, NJ (17N).

The FAA is not proposing modifications to any other parts of the Philadelphia Class B airspace area.

All radials listed in this proposal stated in degrees relative to True North. All geographic coordinates are stated in degrees, minutes, and seconds based on North American Datum 83.

Class B airspace areas are published in paragraph 3000 of FAA Order 7400.9X, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 7, 2013, and effective September 15, 2013, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR section 71.1. The Class B airspace area listed in this document would be published subsequently in the Order.

Regulatory Evaluation Summary

Changes to Federal regulations must undergo several economic analyses. First, Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563 direct that each Federal agency shall propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs. Second, the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96-354) requires agencies to analyze the economic impact of regulatory changes on small entities. Third, the Trade Agreements Act (Pub. L. 96-39) prohibits agencies from setting standards that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. In developing U.S. standards, the Trade Act requires agencies to consider international standards and, where appropriate, that they be the basis of U.S. standards. Fourth, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4) requires agencies to prepare a written assessment of the costs, benefits, and other effects of proposed or final rules that include a Federal mandate likely to result in the expenditure by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more annually (adjusted for inflation with base year of 1995). This portion of the preamble summarizes the FAA's analysis of the economic impacts of this proposed rule.

Department of Transportation Order DOT 2100.5 prescribes policies and procedures for simplification, analysis, and review of regulations. If the expected cost impact is so minimal that a proposed or final rule does not warrant a full evaluation, this order permits that a statement to that effect and the basis for it to be included in the

preamble if a full regulatory evaluation of the cost and benefits is not prepared. Such a determination has been made for this proposed rule. The reasoning for this determination follows:

This proposal would amend the description of Area G of the Philadelphia Class B area to correct a design error that resulted in the Class B airspace being published 2.1 NM larger than intended on the southeast side of the area.

This proposed rule has the following benefits.

1. It would improve the flow of air traffic, enhance safety, and reduce the potential for midair collision in the Philadelphia Class B airspace.

2. It would continue to ensure the containment of large turbine-powered aircraft within Class B airspace as required by FAA directive.

3. It would provide VFR aircraft with additional non-Class B airspace.

4. It would enhance the safety and efficient management of aircraft operations in the Philadelphia terminal area.

The FAA believes that this proposed rule would result in minimal costs.

The FAA has, therefore, determined that this proposed rule is not a “significant regulatory action” as defined in section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, and is not “significant” as defined in DOT's Regulatory Policies and Procedures.

Regulatory Flexibility Determination

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96-354) (RFA) establishes “as a principle of regulatory issuance that agencies shall endeavor, consistent with the objectives of the rule and of applicable statutes, to fit regulatory and informational requirements to the scale of the businesses, organizations, and governmental jurisdictions subject to regulation.” To achieve this principle, agencies are required to solicit and consider flexible regulatory proposals and to explain the rationale for their actions to assure that such proposals are given serious consideration.” The RFA covers a wide-range of small entities, including small businesses, not-for-profit organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

Agencies must perform a review to determine whether a rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. If the agency determines that it will, the agency must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis as described in the RFA.

However, if an agency determines that a rule is not expected to have a significant economic impact on a

substantial number of small entities, section 605(b) of the RFA provides that the head of the agency may so certify and a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required. The certification must include a statement providing the factual basis for this determination, and the reasoning should be clear.

The FAA believes the proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, as the economic impact is expected to be minimal. If an agency determines that a rulemaking will not result in a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the head of the agency may so certify under section 605(b) of the RFA. Therefore, as provided in section 605(b), the head of the FAA certifies that this rulemaking will not result in a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

International Trade Impact Assessment

The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (Pub. L. 96–39), as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (Pub. L. 103–465), prohibits Federal agencies from establishing standards or engaging in related activities that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. Pursuant to these Acts, the establishment of standards is not considered an unnecessary obstacle to the foreign commerce of the United States, so long as the standard has a legitimate domestic objective, such as the protection of safety, and does not operate in a manner that excludes imports that meet this objective. The statute also requires consideration of international standards and, where appropriate, that they be the basis for U.S. standards.

The FAA has assessed the potential effect of this proposed rule and determined that it will enhance safety and is not considered an unnecessary obstacle to trade.

Unfunded Mandates Assessment

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4) requires each Federal agency to prepare a written statement assessing the effects of any Federal mandate in a proposed or final agency rule that may result in an expenditure of \$100 million or more (in 1995 dollars) in any one year by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector; such a mandate is deemed to be a “significant regulatory action.” The FAA currently uses an inflation-adjusted value of \$143.1 million in lieu of \$100 million.

This proposed rule does not contain such a mandate; therefore, the

requirements of Title II of the Act do not apply.

Environmental Review

This proposal will be subject to an environmental analysis in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E, “Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures,” prior to any FAA final regulatory action.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

The Proposed Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D, AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

■ 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9X, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 7, 2013, and effective September 15, 2013, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 3000 Subpart B—Class B Airspace.

* * * * *

AEA PA B Philadelphia, PA [Amended]

Philadelphia International Airport, PA (Primary Airport)

(Lat. 39°52'20" N., long. 75°14'27" W.)

Northeast Philadelphia Airport, PA

(Lat. 40°04'55" N., long. 75°00'38" W.)

Cross Keys Airport, NJ

(Lat. 39°42'20" N., long. 75°01'59" W.)

Boundaries.

By removing the current description of Area G and adding in its place:

Area G. That airspace extending upward from 3,500 feet MSL to and including 7,000 feet MSL within a 20-mile radius of PHL, excluding that airspace south of a line beginning at the intersection of the PHL 20-mile radius and the 158° bearing from PHL, thence direct to the intersection of the PHL 17.9-mile radius and the 138° bearing from PHL, and that airspace bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the PHL 17.9-mile radius and the 138° bearing from PHL, thence direct to the intersection of the PHL 15-mile radius and the 141° bearing from PHL, thence direct to the intersection of the Cross Keys Airport (17N) 1.5-mile radius and the 212° bearing from 17N, thence clockwise via the 1.5-mile radius of 17N to the 257°

bearing from 17N, thence direct to the intersection of the 17N 1.5-mile radius and the 341° bearing from 17N, thence clockwise via the 1.5-mile radius of 17N to the 011° bearing from 17N, thence direct to the intersection of the PHL 15-mile radius and the 127° bearing from PHL, thence direct to the intersection of the PHL 20-mile radius and the 118° bearing from PHL, and Areas A, B, C, D, E and F.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on December 11, 2013.

Ellen Crum,

Acting Manager, Airspace Policy and Regulations Group.

[FR Doc. 2013–30086 Filed 12–18–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA–2013–0859; Airspace Docket No. 13–AWA–4]

RIN 2120–AA66

Proposed Modification of Class B Airspace; Salt Lake City, UT

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This action proposes to amend the description of Area C and Area O of the Salt Lake City Class B airspace area by raising the floor of a small portion of Class B airspace between the Salt Lake City Class B surface area and the Hill Air Force Base (AFB) Class D airspace area. This action proposes to raise the Class B airspace floor in the northeast corner of Area C from 6,000 feet mean seal level (MSL) to 7,500 feet MSL, and redefine the new boundary segment using the power lines underlying the area. This would benefit and enhance non-participating VFR aircraft operations being flown north and south through the Salt Lake Valley over Interstate 15.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 3, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on this proposal to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001; telephone: (202) 366–9826. You must identify FAA Docket No. FAA–2013–0859 and Airspace Docket No. 13–AWA–4 at the beginning of your comments. You may also submit comments through the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>.